

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 13, 16 and 20-23 have been amended. Claims 1-6, 11, 18 and 19 have been allowed. Claims 1-23 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 13 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Haselby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,250,956).

Claims 13, and 22 have been amended to clarify the present application.

The Office Action sets forth that "the examiner can see no structural differences between the sensor in the prior art and applicant's sensor. Further, the examiner can conceive of no structural difference between a sensor designed to sense only two test marks and a sensor capable of sensing only two test marks."

By way of review, claim 13 recites "an error distance detecting unit which detects only the first and second test marks for compensating for the image alignment error according to the detected the first and second test marks"

It is unclear why the examiner alleges that "the examiner can see no structural differences between the sensor in the prior art and applicant's sensor not recited in claim 13.

The applicant did not stated that the claimed test mark sensing unit must be designed to particularly perform the claimed sensing of only two test marks but recites "an error distance detecting unit which detects an actual error distance of only the first and second test marks for compensating for the image alignment error according to the detected the first and second test marks" as recited in claim 13.

It is respectfully submitted that Haselby et al. does not disclose the invention recited in claim 13.

In addition, claim 22 also be allowed at least the same reasons of claim 13, as well as for the additional recitations therein.

Claims 7-10, 12-15, 20, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ikeda (U.S. Patent No. 6,607,260).

At response to Arguments, page 9, line 20 through page 10, line 2, the Examiner assertions states that "Applicant states that the office action's interpretation of Ikeda et al. as being capable of implement the claimed sensing of only two marks is factually incorrect, however applicant has not provided an explanation as to why the sensor of Ikeda et al. is incapable of

sensing only two marks." In contrast of the Examiner assertions, applicant already addressed in the previous response as follows:

In Ikeda et al., in order to get the distances between a-ref1 and a-F and a-ref1 and a-R, the sensor **must** sense the distance not only between a-ref1 and a-F but also a-ref1 and a-R, even though a designated error distance (0). Here, the sensor **must** review at least 3 test marks, such as a-ref1, a-F and, a-R to get the distances to check whether error is "0", in accordance with Ikeda.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that Ikeda et al. at least fails to disclose "a test mark sensing unit which senses only the two test marks, for the measuring of image alignment error", as recited in claim 7, for example, as well as the claimed detecting of an actual error distance based on the two test marks.

Further, the Office Action sets forth that "a test mark print-directing unit (fig.3) which directs the carriage to print two test marks (figs. 1 and 4, a-F and a-R) separated from each other by a designated error distance (0) on a printing medium on which images are printed (column 13, lines 57-65, column 14, lines 13-30)."

In addition, claims 8-10 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from claim 7, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Further, claims 13 and 14 are also deemed patentable due at least the same reasons of claim 7, as well as for the additional limitations therein.

Claims 20, and 21 are amended to incorporate into allowed claim 19. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claims 20, 21 be allowed.

Claim 23 has been amended to clarifying of the application.

The Office Action sets forth that fig. 13 of Haselby shows only representative examples. Certainly, with the myriad of factors that affect dot alignment, dot alignment does not simply fall into one of three categories.

By way of review, it is unclear whether claim 23 is disclosed in fig. 13 of Haselby.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 23 should be allowed.

OBJECTIONS OF CLAIMS:

Even though, claims 16 and 17 are not being addressed in the detailed office action, it appears objected to according to Office Action Summary's Disposition of claims number 7

checked. Thus, claims 16 has been amended to incorporate claim 14. Thus, reconsideration of claim 16 is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 is deemed patentable due at least to its depending from claim 16, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

12/29/2006

By:


Gene M. Garner, II
Registration No. 34,172

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501